AUG 6 1945
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No. 301

BENJAMIN HALL and ALTUS HALL,
Petitioners

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

JAMES F. KEMP
JOHN M. JOHNSON
Attorneys for Petitioners

INDEX

	Page
Orders and judgments below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question presented	2
Statute involved	2
Statement	2
Specification of errors to be urged	4
Reasons for granting the writ	4
Appendix	6

CITATION

Case:

United States v. Falcone, 311 U. S. 305 5

Statute:

Sec. 88 of Title 18 U. S. C. 2, 6

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1944

No.....

BENJAMIN HALL and ALTUS HALL,
Petitioners

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

---

Benjamin Hall and Altus Hall pray that a writ of certiorari be issued to review the judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, entered in the above entitled cause July 11, 1945, affirming the orders and judgments of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia which overruled petitioners' motion for a directed verdict.

ORDERS AND JUDGMENTS BELOW

The order and judgment of the court overruling petitioners' motion for a directed verdict appears in the

record at pp. 113, 136. The opinion of the Circuit Court of Appeals appears in the record at p. 149.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Circuit Court of Appeals was entered July 11, 1945 (R. 152). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Sec. 240 (a) of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) Was the evidence sufficient to authorize the conviction of petitioners; and

(2) Did the court err in admitting evidence against petitioners which had been suppressed as to a co-defendant and co-conspirator.

STATUTE INVOLVED

The statute involved is Sec. 88 of Title 18 U. S. C.; Criminal Code, Sec. 37; Revised Statute, Sec. 5440, and will be found in the Appendix, infra, p. 6.

STATEMENT

Petitioners were indicted at the March Term 1944 by a United States Grand Jury in and for the Atlanta Division of the Northern District of Georgia (R. 1). The indictment contained one count and charged petitioners with a conspiracy to violate the Internal Revenue Laws. Petitioners went to trial on the 4th day of November 1944 and the jury returned a verdict of guilty as charged (R. 8). On January 19, 1945, the court sentenced each of

petitioners to serve a sentence of two years and to pay a fine of $2000.00 each (R. 8-11).

The pertinent facts, as disclosed by the evidence, are substantially as follows:

Petitioners were engaged in the used car business in the City of Atlanta. They were jointly indicted with Harold Hefner and were charged with conspiring with him and with various co-conspirators who were not indicted. The great weight of the evidence adduced upon the trial centered around the place of business of petitioners. Various special agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit testified about things they observed around this place of business during their investigation which continued for several months. These agents testified that they never did observe any illicit whiskey or any other thing around this place of business which was *per se* criminal. They testified that they saw various and sundry automobiles and trucks go in and out of this place of business almost every hour during the days when the place was under observation. Petitioners were never apprehended and were never seen on any automobile transporting illicit liquor and were never seen commiting any illegal offense. There was no evidence to directly connect petitioners with any illegal act. All the acts of petitioners were as consistent with innocence as with guilt. Petitioners were at all times in the used car business and were trading generally in used cars and trucks.

Harold Hefner, the other co-defendant, was not tried with petitioners. The court suppressed the evidence about a large distillery which had been destroyed at Hefner's home near Atlanta. Although the evidence was suppressed

as to Hefner the court admitted the evidence about this distillery over the objection of petitioners.

At the conclusion of all of the evidence petitioners (defendants in trial court) moved for a directed verdict upon the grounds that the evidence was insufficient to warrant a conviction of petitioners or either of them. This motion was overruled (R. 113, 136). Petitioners were sentenced to pay a fine of $2000.00 each and to serve two years in prison (R. 8-10).

Upon appeal by petitioners to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit the judgment of the court below was affirmed (R. 152).

SPECIFICATION OF ERRORS TO BE URGED

The Circuit Court of Appeals erred:

1. In holding that the District Court of the United States did not err in refusing to direct a verdict for petitioners on the ground that the evidence was insufficient to warrant their conviction.

2. In holding that the District Court did not err in admitting evidence over the objection of petitioners which had been suppressed as to a co-defendant and co-conspirator.

3. In not reversing the judgment of the District Court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The question involved is whether the evidence was

sufficient to warrant the conviction of petitioners and whether the evidence which had been suppressed as to another defendant and co-conspirator was admissible against petitioners.

One cannot be held as a member of a conspiracy upon mere proof that he had knowledge of it or negatively acquiesced in the offense. There must be active participation in the crime.

United States v. Falcone
311 U. S. 205

The evidence against petitioners was of such character that it was necessary to base an inference upon an inference in order to hold that they were guilty. Petitioners were not connected with any transaction that was *per se* illegal. There is no direct evidence that they entered into a conspiracy with any person and there are no circumstances disclosed by the evidence which are sufficient to warrant the holding that there was a conspiracy existing between petitioners and other parties. The evidence was entirely too remote to authorize the conviction of petitioners. Petitioners contend that the evidence about a large distillery which was being operated near Atlanta was inadmissible against them for that the evidence had been suppressed on motion of co-defendant Harold Hefner. There is no evidence to directly connect petitioners with the operation of this distillery. They could only be guilty of active participation therein by conspiring with Harold Hefner who was operating the distillery. Since under the law the evidence could not be used against Harold Hefner, then necessarily such evidence was inadmissible against petitioners.

For the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that the petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

JAMES F. KEMP
JOHN M. JOHNSON
Attorneys for Petitioners

APPENDIX

Section 88 of Title 18 U. S. C.; Criminal Code Sec. 37 provides:

> "If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such parties do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than two years, or both. (R. S. Sec. 5440; May 17, 1879, c. 8, 21 Stat. 4; Mar. 4, 1909, c. 321, Sec. 37, 35 Stat. 1096.)"

INDEX

	Page
Opinion below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Questions presented	2
Statement	2
Argument	5
Conclusion	6

CITATIONS

Cases:

Bushouse v. *United States*, 67 F. 2d 843	5
Delaney v. *United States*, 263 U. S. 586	5
Dooley, In re, 48 F. 2d 121	6
Remus v. *United States*, 291 Fed. 501, certiorari denied, 263 U. S. 717	6
Schwartz v. *United States*, 294 Fed. 528	6
United States v. *Johnson*, 319 U. S. 503	5
United States v. *Stappenback*, 61 F. 2d 955	6

664410—45

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

No. 301

BENJAMIN HALL AND ALTUS HALL, PETITIONERS

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN OPPOSITION

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the circuit court of appeals (R. 149–152) has not yet been reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the circuit court of appeals was entered July 11, 1945 (R. 152). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed August 6, 1945. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Section 240 (a) of the Judicial Code, as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925. See also Rules XI and XIII of the Criminal Appeals Rules promulgated by this Court May 7, 1934.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether there is sufficient evidence to support petitioners' convictions.

2. Whether it was proper to admit against petitioners evidence suppressed as to a codefendant who was not tried with petitioners.

STATEMENT

An indictment for conspiracy was returned against petitioners and one Hefner in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, charging that they, and other persons named as coconspirators but not indicted, conspired to defraud the United States and to violate the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code pertaining to the manufacture, transportation, sale, purchase, and distribution of liquor (R. 1–7). Hefner's motion to suppress evidence in respect of a distillery found in the curtilage of his residence on the ground that the search and seizure was illegal, was granted (R. 12). The trial was severed as to Hefner (R. 12–13) and petitioners were tried and found guilty (R. 8). They were each sentenced to imprisonment for two years and to pay a fine of $2,000, the sentence against Benjamin Hall to commence after the expiration of other sentences which he was then serving (R. 8–9, 10–11). On appeal, the judgments were affirmed (R. 152).

The evidence for the Government may be summarized as follows:

On November 18, 1942, Georgia officials seized a non-registered distillery operated by Hefner about twelve miles from Atlanta, Georgia (R. 45). Later that same month petitioner Benjamin Hall approached one Kidder, who owned a farm on Highway 42 in the vicinity of Conley, Georgia, and told Kidder that he had a purchaser for the farm (R. 25–26). Hall returned with Hefner that afternoon and Hefner arranged to purchase the farm for cash (R. 26–27). Neither Hall nor Hefner inspected the property carefully and Hefner insisted on quick possession (R. 26–27).

On January 8, 1943, a state officer and a federal agent stationed on Highway 42 in the vicinity of Conley observed a cream colored Ford coupe followed by a Ford coach. When the cars approached the point where the officers were parked, the coach was allowed to pass the coupe, and the speed of the latter was reduced, but the officers were unable to pass it because of traffic coming from the opposite direction. The coach was nevertheless overtaken and found to contain 165 gallons of illicit whiskey. After the coach was stopped the coupe turned around and went in the other direction. (R. 13–15, 21–23.) The coupe was registered in the name of Benjamin Hall (R. 21, 60).

On April 9, 1943, federal officers found a large non-registered still in the tobacco barn of the farm which Hefner had purchased and also dis-

covered 150 gallons of non-tax-paid whiskey, yeast, fruit jars, coke, barrels and other equipment (R. 15–16, 33–35).

In August 1943, petitioners rented a building in Atlanta, Georgia, formerly occupied by the Whitehall Mattress Company (R. 42–43, 120). They obtained a license to deal in used cars (R. 38), but officers who observed the premises during the month of September saw no used cars except one 1942 model Cadillac (R. 38, 101). The mattress company sign was not removed and no signs advertising used cars were placed on the building (R. 126). Fruit jars (R. 17–18, 39, 41, 52–53, 58, 66, 89), sacks of what appeared to be sugar (R. 64), cartons of yeast (R. 66), and bags of coke (R. 57) were observed stored in the premises, or being delivered to or taken from the premises. Petitioners were frequently seen there (R. 17, 18, 48, 53–54, 57–58, 64–67, 88) and Hefner occasionally (R. 56–57, 67, 88, 89, 93). Petitioner Altus Hall was observed driving a truck containing sacks which appeared to be sugar to the premises (R. 64), and petitioner Benjamin Hall was seen carrying a carton of yeast from the building to his car (R. 66). Cars and trucks regularly visited the premises (R. 18, 36, 53, 57, 64–66, 88, 91). A truck driven by Altus Hall for which he and others constructed a body (R. 57, 89) was later driven by Hefner when he obtained coke and fruit jars (R. 92–94). A green Chevrolet truck, which was observed at the Whitehall Mat-

tress Company premises being loaded with fruit jars (R. 64–65), and driven by Altus Hall (R. 92), was subsequently seen at Hefner's farm, and later that day it was seized with 42 gallons of illicit liquor (R. 16, 112). A blue paneled truck observed at the Whitehall building (R. 51–52) was subsequently found to be carrying illicit liquor (R. 91, 112).

ARGUMENT

1. Petitioners' attack on the sufficiency of the evidence to support their convictions (Pet. 2, 4–5) presents no question for further review by this Court. *United States* v. *Johnson,* 319 U. S. 503, 518; *Delaney* v. *United States,* 263 U. S. 586, 589–590. The evidence, which is summarized in the Statement, *supra,* and in the opinion of the circuit court of appeals (R. 150–151), fully justifies the jury's conclusion that petitioners were engaged in a conspiracy with Hefner to violate the liquor laws.

2. Petitioners' further contention that it was improper to admit against them evidence as to the still found at Hefner's farm in April 1943, which was suppressed as to Hefner (Pet. 2, 4, 5), is without merit. It is well established that the constitutional protection against unlawful search and seizure is a personal one, and that evidence obtained in violation of one defendant's rights may be introduced against a codefendant whose rights have not been violated. *Bushouse* v. *United*

States, 67 F. 2d 843, 844 (C. C. A. 6); *United States* v. *Stappenback,* 61 F. 2d 955, 958 (C. C. A. 2); *In re Dooley,* 48 F. 2d 121 (C. C. A. 2); *Schwartz* v. *United States,* 294 Fed. 528 (C. C. A. 5); *Remus* v. *United States,* 291 Fed. 501, 511 (C. C. A. 6), certiorari denied, 263 U. S. 717.

CONCLUSION

The decision below is correct and it presents no conflict of decisions or question of general importance. We therefore respectfully submit that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

HAROLD JUDSON,
Acting Solicitor General.
THERON L. CAUDLE,
Assistant Attorney General.
ROBERT S. ERDAHL,
BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
Attorneys.

SEPTEMBER, 1945.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1945